

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-7 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 7 are independent.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Request for Listing of Cited References

As previously mentioned, references of Davis, U.S. Application Publication 2002/0001395, and of Tsang, U.S. Patent 6,510,002, have not been listed in a Form PTO-892.

Applicant requests that a Form PTO-892 be prepared that lists these references.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication 2002/0001395 (Davis) in view of U.S. Application Publication 2003/0058354 (Parulski), and further in view of U.S. Application Publication 2002/0030675 (Kawai). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As recited in claim 1, a communications section “ externally obtains image data having a filename and representing an image.”

As further recited in claim 1, the claimed electronic apparatus further includes “a controller that analyzes information attached to the filename and the image data, extracts the information as attributes of the image data, and produces, from the image data, thumbnail image data representing a thumbnail image.”

In other words, the claimed electronic apparatus externally obtains image data and extracts information as attributes of the image data, then produces thumbnail image data from the externally received image data.

The Office Action alleges that a transceiver 52, and description at para. 40-42, disclose this claimed feature.

At paragraphs 40-43, Davis discloses that a camera is equipped with one or more external interfaces to transfer images, image related data, and operating parameters to and from external devices. Davis generally discloses that the types of interfaces can vary from camera to camera, and can include transceivers and receivers for wireless communications.

The Office Action alleges that a description at paras. 35, 95-97 discloses the claimed features of extracting information as attributes and producing thumbnail image data.

Paragraph 95 describes a steganographic encoder that may be included in the camera.

Applicant notes that a standard dictionary definition of “steganography” is –the art or practice of concealing a message, image, or file within another message image or file.

In a conventional sense, Davis discloses that “the encoder converts auxiliary data to be embedded in the image into watermark signal and combines the watermark signal with the image.” Davis describes the auxiliary data as including “one or more references, a machine instruction or set of instructions, and other data items about the image.” Davis further discloses that “the camera-based encoder obtains auxiliary data to be embedded in an image from memory, or some other device in the camera.”

Applicant submits that Davis discloses auxiliary data obtained from memory or some other device. Davis does not disclose extracting auxiliary data from externally obtained image data. Also, Davis does not disclose producing thumbnail image data from the externally received image data.

According to the present specification, image data is obtained by downloading through the Internet, receiving an e-mail message, or photographing by using the image sensing section 15. Further according to the present specification, “information added to the obtained image data, a filename thereof, and a file are analyzed to obtain such information as a type of the image data (format), a dimension of the image data, and a copyright (#12), and these pieces of information

thus obtained are memorized in the file of the image data as an attribute thereof (#13).” (specification at para. [0046]).

Applicant submits that Davis, Parulski, and Kawai do not disclose dimensional information included as attributes extracted from externally obtained image data.

In order to further clarify the differences over the cited prior art, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite that the claimed controller “analyzes information attached to the filename and the image data, extracts the information as attributes including dimensional information of the image data...”

For at least these reasons, as well as the claim amendment, Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In addition, further recited in claim 1, is

“a first memory that memorizes, as a single file, the image data, the attributes of the image data, and the thumbnail image data together;

a second memory that is provided separately from the first memory and further memorizes the attributes of the image data.”

In other words, the claim recites that the image data, the attributes of the image data, and the thumbnail image data are memorized together as a single file, and that the attributes of the image data are memorized in a separate second memory.

With respect to the claimed “first memory,” the Office Action indicates that Davis teaches the memory subsystem 20 includes a combination of ROM, RAM, and removable storage devices such as a flash memory card. The Office Action does not mention the claimed feature of a “single file.”

Applicant submits that though Davis discloses “maintaining auxiliary data separate from the associated image” in [0104] and [0105], at that time, only a reference to the external, auxiliary data is embedded in the image.

Applicant submits that Davis does not disclose image data, the attributes of the image data, and the thumbnail image data are memorized together as a single file.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicant submits that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness.

With respect to the claimed second memory, the Office Action alleges that a metadata server in Davis teaches the claimed second memory.

Davis at paragraph [0105] discloses that “a reference to this external, auxiliary data may be embedded in the image (e.g., in a watermark), in the image file metadata, or both. Subsequently, Applicant submits that metadata server of Davis is an external device (see Fig. 4) that may include image file metadata having a reference to external auxiliary data.

To the contrary, claim 1 requires that attributes of image data be memorized in both first memory (in a single file as claimed) and second memory.

In addition, Applicant submits that Parulski fails to make up for the deficiencies in Davis.

In particular, Applicant submits that Parulski also does not disclose image data, the attributes of the image data, and the thumbnail image data are memorized together as a single file. The Office Action only indicates that Parulski teaches wherein the memory further stores thumbnail image data.

Still further recited in claim 1 is:

“a display section that displays the image represented by the image data in a two dimensional mode or a three dimensional mode for stereoscopic view utilizing image data for left eye and image data for right eye, respectively, according to whether dimensional information included in the attributes memorized in the second memory represents a two dimensional image or a three dimensional image.”

In other words, the claimed “display section” can display an image represented by the image data in a two dimensional mode or a three dimensional mode for stereoscopic view, and the display in a two dimensional mode or a three dimensional mode is according to the dimensional information included in the attributes.

The Office Action alleges that Davis teaches that metadata in images also applies to other media signals, including computer graphics models (e.g., two-dimensional, three-dimensional graphical models and animation), citing para. [0177] in Davis. (Office Action at page 4).

Applicant submits that the three-dimensional graphical models disclosed in Davis do not constitute image data for stereoscopic view utilizing image data for left eye and image data for right eye, as required in the claims. Subsequently, Applicant submits that Davis does not disclose image data for display in a three dimensional mode for stereoscopic view.

Furthermore, as mentioned above, none of the cited prior art references discloses dimensional information included as attributes extracted from externally obtained image data. Thus, Applicant submits that Davis, Parulski, and Kawai fail to disclose the claimed display section.

Still further, Applicant submits that Kawai fails to make up for the deficiencies in Davis and Parulski.

The Office Action alleges that Kawai teaches a display section (first and second database clients 1a and 1b) that displays the image represented by the image data in a two dimensional mode or a three dimensional mode for stereoscopic view, according to whether dimensional information (data ID 22a, 27, 29 of Fig. 3B-D) included in the attributes memorized in the second memory represents a two dimensional image or a three dimensional image (citing paras. [0052]-[0057]).

In Kawai a database client 1a or 1b transmits a data request packet (Fig. 3C) to request 3D data specified by a data ID 27, in which the packet includes a field 24 that describes information about the database client (see Fig. 4) and a data format 25.

A 3D database server responds by transmitting a data response packet (Fig. 3D) that provides information corresponding to the requesting display device information 24.

Subsequently, Applicant submits that Kawai also fails to teach at least the claimed first memory that memorizes, as a single file, the image data, the attributes of the image data, and the thumbnail image data together, and second memory that further memorizes the attributes of the image data.

The above arguments apply as well to claim 7.

With regard to dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, Applicant submits that claims 2, 3, 5, 6 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2, 3, 5, 6 are allowable based on their dependence from claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Further, claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, Parulski, and Kawai, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,965,413 (Wada). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that claim 4 is allowable based on its dependence from claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert W. Downs**, Registration No. 48222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: April 28, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Down # 48222
Charles Gorenstein Robert Down
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000